	DBMLSERS	Sentence	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK		
2			
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	Δ,	
4	V.		12 CR 90 (AKH)
5	KAREEM SERAGELDIN,		
6	Defendant.		
7		x	
8			New York, N.Y. November 22, 2013
9			11:42 a.m.
10	Before:		
11	HON. ALVIN K. HELLERSTEIN,  District Judge		
12			
13			District oddye
14	APPEARANCES		
15	PREET BHARARA  United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York EUGENE E. INGOGLIA Assistant United States Attorney		
16			
17			
18	KOBRE & KIM LLP Attorneys for Defen	odan+	
19	BY: SEAN P. CASEY MICHAEL S. KIM	idaire	
20	SCOTT McCULLOCH		
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
	I .		

DBMLSERS Sentence

1 (Case called) THE COURT: So you read the presentence investigative 2 3 report, Mr. Serageldin? 4 THE DEFENDANT: I have, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: And discussed it with your counsel? 6 THE DEFENDANT: I have, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Counsel, are there any errors that you wish me to consider for correction? 8 9 MR. CASEY: No, your Honor. Our objections are 10 included in the addendum to the final PSR. 11 THE COURT: And they've been taken care of? 12 MR. CASEY: They have, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: So you're satisfied with the facts as set 14 out in the report? 15 MR. CASEY: We are, your Honor. 16 THE COURT: And is the government? 17 MR. INGOGLIA: We are, Judge. THE COURT: I find the facts as set out in the 18 19 investigative report. 20 Mr. Serageldin pleaded before me on April 12, 2013. His plea of guilty contained a discussion of the sentencing 21 22 guidelines, and I find them to be the same as that which was 23 agreed.

The offense is analyzed under Section 2B1.1 with a base level of six. The extent of loss is considered to be

24

25

DBMLSERS Sentence

between two and a half million dollars and \$7 million, which yields an upward adjustment of 18. Mr. Serageldin was the leader and organizer of more than five people. Under Section 3B1.1, another four levels are upwardly adjusted. This makes the gross offense level to be 28. Three levels are reduced for acceptance of responsibility in a timely basis, and the net offense behavior level is 25.

Do I have it right, Mr. Ingoglia?

MR. INGOGLIA: You do, Judge.

THE COURT: Mr. Casey?

MR. CASEY: You do, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Serageldin has no criminal history

points.

So under net offense behavior level of 25, criminal history category I, the range of custodian punishment provided by the sentencing guidelines is 57 months at the lowest end, and because the crime is subject to a five-year statutory maximum, 60 months is the upward end, 57 to 60 months.

Supervised release is two to three years.

Do I have that right, Mr. Ingoglia? I don't have it in my notes, but I think that's what it is.

MR. INGOGLIA: Three years is the maximum. I believe that's right, Judge.

MR. CASEY: Actually, your Honor, it's one to three years.

DBMLSERS Sentence

1	THE COURT: One to three years.		
2	MR. CASEY: Yes.		
3	THE COURT: Yes, that's right.		
4	MR. CASEY: The guideline recommendation.		
5	THE COURT: Yes. So the guidelines speak to a range		
6	of custodial punishment of 57 to 60 months' custody, followed		
7	by one to three years of supervised release.		
8	The guideline range for a fine is from \$10,000 to		
9	\$100,000. The statutory maximum is \$250,000.		
10	Is that right?		
11	MR. INGOGLIA: That is right, Judge.		
12	THE COURT: Mr. Casey?		
13	MR. CASEY: Yes, your Honor, that's correct.		
14	THE COURT: Okay. So Mr. Serageldin committed his		
15	crime posted in London for Credit Suisse. He was the head of a		
16	trading department of Credit Suisse and his crime is described		
17	in the presentence investigative report and I'm sure we'll be		
18	discussing it.		
19	Without my further comment, let me turn it over		
20	Mr. Casey.		
21	MR. KIM: With your Honor's permission, Mr. Casey and		
22	I addressed different points that we want to advance to the		
23	Court.		
24	THE COURT: I'll let you both speak.		
2.5	MD IZIM. V Thenk		

MR. KIM: Yes. Thank you.

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I have a very extensive submission. it's my practice, Mr. Kim, to allow counsel to tell me anything that they wish to tell me. My interest is to make sure that everything that defense counsel and government counsel think I should consider in sentencing is told to me and you're sure that I have grasped it.

MR. KIM: Yes, your Honor. And I know your Honor's practice is to read all the materials carefully, so I will not repeat.

THE COURT: You can.

MR. KIM: I will try to focus.

THE COURT: Don't feel constrained.

MR. KIM: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Tell me what you want to tell me.

MR. KIM: Your Honor, I think I want to mainly focus my observations on the characteristics of Mr. Serageldin and the context in which the crime occurred because I think they are important factors for the Court's decision process.

I think in addition to some of the other points that Mr. Casey will explain to you, I think there are at least two unusual aspects to the case before you in the area of the characteristics of the defendant and the context in which the crime occurred.

I think first the context and motivation for the crime and when it occurred and how it occurred, I know your Honor has Sentence

**DBMLSERS** 

handled a number of different cases coming out of the financial crisis and, over the years, white collar criminal cases. And at least in my experience the cases involving the mismarking of assets on books follow one of a few different patterns.

Sometimes you have a trader who is mounting ever greater losses and in an attempt to cover that up to preserve one's compensation based on the profit loss numbers, and then sometimes to try to advance a picture of profitability, there's mismarking going on at a scale where there's a false picture presented to the supervisors to try to earn money and to try to conceal losses that that trader caused. And I'm sure your Honor has seen cases that fit into that fact pattern.

Sometimes there are cases where the persons on the trading desk try to affect specific positions because it's heavily tied so some big pay-out that they're trying to achieve by virtue of their trading.

Now, I think what's a little unusual about this case is that while the actual conduct, the actual physical acts are very similar to those other cases in the sense of positions were mismarked, the context in which it occurred I think really bears note. You have a person who I think really at the very young age of 33 was given a tremendous amount of responsibility in a very complex organization. And you also have a person who just -- I'm sure your Honor has looked at Mr. Serageldin's history -- from an immigrant family, who's worked tremendously

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

hard to get to where he was at that young age.

The unusual aspect is that Mr. Serageldin essentially discovers that mismarking had already been going on. And the mismarking itself by really I think most reasonable views has no real material effect on Mr. Serageldin's financial fortunes in the bank except --

THE COURT: How do we know that?

MR. KIM: Your Honor, I think the actual scope of Mr. Serageldin's responsibilities as set out in our submission and the way that his compensation was overall calculated means that the primary motivation of Mr. Serageldin here was really a terrible misjudgment to avoid embarrassment.

THE COURT: You know, I've read that. It's hard to separate the different permutations of hubris. A person rises to a certain level with certain responsibility and gets certain emoluments from it and there's a mixture of money, pride, ambition, placement in an organization, and so many other different factors, but they all run together. If you do well, you get paid more.

In the business that Mr. Serageldin was in, salary tends to be relatively minor in the range of compensation a person looks for. Bonus is very important. Participation in equity is very important.

So it's hard for me to accept that Mr. Serageldin did not at least harbor the thought that if he showed a profit,

Sentence

**DBMLSERS** 

he'd be better able to get a decent bonus -- more than decent, good bonus.

MR. KIM: Your Honor, what I think is the most important point there is the circumstances under which Mr. Serageldin did --

THE COURT: I just add to that, what do we work for,
Mr. Kim, you, me, others -- we want to be the best we can be.
We want to be the very best we can be in our profession, and we want to do the best job we can for our client. Are we looking essentially for money? In a way, yes, but primarily no. I think if we were paid less, we'd work just as hard and do just as well, and that's proved by all my colleagues on this court.

MR. KIM: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: So money is a factor, but, and I think that's what you mean when you say that Mr. Serageldin was not driven by money. He may have been wanting the money, it may have come with him, but he would probably do the same thing if there were less money.

MR. KIM: Yes, your Honor. I think in terms of assessing --

THE COURT: Maybe. Who knows, who knows.

MR. KIM: I think in terms of assessing an individual's character, that is not to say that his conduct is excusable in any way because obviously he's pled guilty to it, and as your Honor can see from our submission, that's not the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

point of our submission.

Rather, in assessing a person's character, I think there's a significant difference between a person who is mismarking positions or putting in fraudulent statements because they think it will advantage them and they do so as part of a calculated strategy, whereas here --

THE COURT: Would you mind if I interrupted.

MR. KIM: Yes, your Honor. It's your courtroom, so you can interrupt me any time you want.

THE COURT: I think it's not only for the point of being a prerogative of the judge -- it may not be, but I do it -- I think you need to know my mind and I read your material so I've given it a lot of thought, a lot of thought.

Mr. Serageldin is like you or me, got a family, we do our job. We do our job as best we can, work very hard. But there's this essential difference: He was in a place where there was a climate that made it conducive to what he did. bank was, as you call it, mismarking, but showing false profits much more extensively than Mr. Serageldin was doing. Mr. Serageldin's role was a small piece of an overall evil climate within the bank and with many other banks.

But I can't get past the point that he was a leader, and when things are run around you, there's no necessity for the leader to follow suit. Someone has got to stand up for what's right. And when he doesn't stand up for what's right,

Sentence

when a person doesn't do what's right and starts doing criminal things, he's a criminal.

MR. KIM: Yes, your Honor, and would I not disagree with any of those statements.

I think Mr. Serageldin's primary failure here, criminal failure, was not standing up for what was right, even though the conduct obviously lasted just a few months in an otherwise very expansive career. He had accomplished and done a lot in the short career, and the conduct itself was confined in time. The nature of that conduct, as your Honor points out, is that he was in a leadership position where he could have stood up and stopped the conduct that was going on and that was wrong. And I think just —

THE COURT: Maybe not stopped, but at least he didn't have to participate in it.

MR. KIM: Yes, your Honor, I think on both of those counts.

And just my simple point on this first area is that while just as wrong, I think where one sees in the factual context for a limited time he failed to stop it and allowed it to go on and essentially functioned as the group leader while it was going on, while it was wrong, it is different and a little bit unusual in character from a lot of the other cases.

And I think secondly, your Honor, I think this goes the comments your Honor just made, the amount of punishment

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that has been inflicted on Mr. Serageldin is truly unusual I think primarily as a result of his being in the wrong place at the wrong time. Because he is really by some counts the only person that has been singled out in a criminal case for what some people call the credit crisis, financial crisis, the media has taken a disproportionate interest in him.

And as your Honor knows from some of the materials submitted to you, but also just generally, the amount of publicity around Mr. Serageldin and the nature of the publicity -- I had started representing him from back when he was in the U.K. -- on both sides of the pond, there's a great amount of media that really portrays him as the primary architect in many ways of the credit crisis and really a significant villain in the story, which I think based on the details of the situation as your Honor understands it is disproportionate and inaccurate and unfair. But he's had to live with the real consequences of that.

Yes, he's done something wrong and he deserves to be punished and he is the first one to tell you that. But I think the way that his name has really been portrayed in the media over the last several years has absolutely destroyed what semblance of self-respect and dignity he had and has destroyed his relationships with many friends and family. And I think in assessing the deterrence and punishment factors that your Honor has to weigh, I think that is truly unusual and deserves some

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

consideration.

Thank you, Mr. Kim. THE COURT:

MR. CASEY: Your Honor, I want to pick up on a couple points that Mr. Kim left there. No. 1, in calculating the right amount of punishment that is due here but not greater than necessary, it strikes me as those punishments that Mr. Kim was discussing need to be, need to be factored in or need to reduce the amount of punishment, that is, that you're going to give to Mr. Serageldin.

Mr. Kim discussed the press and I won't do that again, but the real punishment that's already been levied on him is when this happened, Credit Suisse took back \$25 million in deferred compensation from Mr. Serageldin. Now, that number in these trading cases when you see millions of dollars and billions of dollars flying around, it's easy to lose to lose perspective on what that means. But this is actually 25 million real dollars going to our client, a life-changing amount.

> This is the equity issue? THE COURT:

This is the -- yes, your Honor. MR. CASEY: his deferred compensation. An important point of that is \$20 million of that windfall back to Credit Suisse, \$20 million of that was earned long before his conduct ever began. is sort of the beginning of the punishment along with how he's been portrayed in the press.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Why should I consider that?

MR. CASEY: Well, your Honor, when you have to find a sentence --

THE COURT: If someone commits or wants to commit a financial crime and has to give money back, why does that reduce the culpability for the crime?

MR. CASEY: Well, this is different than giving the money back.

> THE COURT: Why is it different?

MR. CASEY: Because \$20 million of this, the large chunk of this, was earned by Mr. Serageldin years before this conduct even started, years before the credit crisis. initial 20 million has nothing to do with his conduct. It just had to do with the fact of his employment and the way Credit Suisse's compensation regime is designed.

> Why is it relevant? THE COURT:

MR. CASEY: Well, because, your Honor, our job here today, the Court's job here today is to find a sentence that's sufficient but not greater than necessary to meet the ends of sentencing and to meet the ends of justice. And here you have to look at what's already been -- what's on Mr. Serageldin's shoulders. And here there's \$20 million on his shoulder, there's an SEC settlement on his shoulder, there's a million dollars in forfeiture on his shoulder. He's lost an ability to work in his only profession, his chosen profession. And as

Sentence

Mr. Kim said, his face has been broadcast across the financial press and will be again today is my estimation.

All those things together are something unique to him that we don't see in every white collar case here. We don't see numbers like that being taken away. We don't see the cover of the Wall Street Journal on a regular basis portraying most of the white collar defendants that come through this courtroom.

The next point I want to discuss a little bit more about the history and characteristics of Mr. Serageldin. I just want to focus on one part and that part is the unusual extent to which he accepted responsibility here. When this investigation was going on — and this investigation took many years to complete — by the SEC and by Department of Justice, Mr. Serageldin was living abroad. He was living in London. He was under no obligation whatsoever to make any contact with the government, but he did. He was under no obligation to stay even within the reach of the government, but he did. And when this case became a reality —

THE COURT: Tell me what he did.

MR. CASEY: When the case -- he stayed in London. He stayed in touch with the Department of Justice.

THE COURT: How did it happen, who initiated what?

MR. CASEY: Oh. He had previous counsel before Kobre & Kim and they maintained communications. There was a couple

Sentence

interviews that Mr. Serageldin spoke.

THE COURT: Did Mr. Serageldin approach the Department of Justice first or did the Department of Justice approach Mr. Serageldin first?

MR. CASEY: Immediately upon being charged,
Mr. Serageldin hired Kobre & Kim to approach the Department of
Justice to arrange a plea agreement with the Department of
Justice and also to arrange a settlement with the SEC. That
was our primary task here.

With that, he did not fight extradition. He did not fight the case. He announced quickly -- and I think the government will support this -- he announced quickly his intention to plead here, to save the government the trial, but really to save the government extradition which, as the Court knows, could have drawn this episode out for years and years even from today. We could be five or more years from now before this case would really come to a head.

THE COURT: Could also have been prosecuted in London.

MR. CASEY: Yes, your Honor, but our understanding is the British regulators took a pass on this case. They viewed the conduct here and they decided --

THE COURT: Probably because the Department of Justice was interested.

MR. CASEY: I believe, your Honor, that's possibly a factor, but it also took place before, from what I understand,

Sentence

but Mr. Ingoglia can probably shed some light on that fact. 1 I think the way he accepted responsibility here is 2 3 almost the model of how the government, how the Court would 4 want someone to behave just before and certainly after they 5 were charged by the government. And I understand he's awarded 6 some three points under the guidelines for that and that's 7 significant. But that's, if he was charged outside on that street, he would have gotten those three points. 8 9 Mr. Serageldin gave up a lot here and what I'm trying to say 10 here --11 THE COURT: The point you're making to me is that I 12 should, in finding a just punishment, take into consideration 13 the very large amount of rehabilitation that's already 14 occurred. 15 MR. CASEY: I think that's right, and what that shows 16 about this man's character and the person that he is, the 17 person he was before the crime and the person he was after the 18 crime. Except for that month or that six weeks of this crime, 19 we've seen nothing and I think the government will offer 20 nothing outside of the indictment that he's done wrong in his 21 life. He's led an otherwise very admirable life here. 22 THE COURT: Two children. 23 MR. CASEY: Your Honor --24 THE COURT: Married how long? 25 He has three Godchildren, your Honor. MR. CASEY:

Sentence

does not have any children. He's been with his partner for 14 years.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. CASEY: I want to turn briefly to disparities, 3553(a)(6), and the need to avoid the unwarranted disparities that could occur if Mr. Serageldin was given any substantial period of incarceration. Obviously, the policy here is extremely important. The policy is that the Court and the courts across the United States will treat similarly situated defendants in the same manner, similarly situated defendants, but also similarly situated people that may engage in the same conduct. We cited many of these in our brief, and I just want to highlight two of these briefly for the Court.

First is a Judge Rakoff sentencing in *United States v*. Argo. Argo is essentially a stock options backdating case from a few years ago and that person also pled guilty to the same charge that Mr. Serageldin pled guilty to. Ms. Argo was the CFO of a public company. Her guidelines were 97 to 121 months, and Judge Rakoff actually gave her six months. And I bring up this case not just for the fact of the giant variance from the guidelines, but really for the fact that the conduct here which Mr. Serageldin pled guilty to and options backdating are extremely similar.

Ms. Argo's job was to assess the value of certain securities and put those onto the books and records of the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

corporation. Hers was actually much more compensation oriented then ours, but this is essentially a mismarking of the value of a certain level of securities. Obviously, there's distinctions here, but it's very similar conduct.

One of the parts of Judge Rakoff's, of the sentencing transcript that I wanted to bring to the Court's attention was this, was that the court was persuaded and certainly credited the argument that what was termed a slightly broader disparity argument. The slightly broader disparity argument was, as your Honor probably remembers, the stock options backdating scandal, when it broke, there was a lot of investigations, there was a lot of press, there was a lot of investigations within the Department of Justice. I can attest to that at the time.

The end result though, your Honor, very few people actually went to prison. There were hundreds of restatements. Obviously, a lot of public companies engaged in this conduct, but nobody really went to prison except for Ms. Argo for six months and maybe six or seven other individuals.

When that happened, the court seemed to recognize that a certain disparity had already occurred because if people are out there not getting charged for the exact same conduct that one person would be charged with, that's a situation where we have an unwarranted disparity. I understand the government can get up and say that's not the text in the statute and I would agree with him. But that's the spirit of this and that's the

Sentence

spirit of trying to fashion a just sentence here, trying to look at why a 34-year-old, middle managing director at a bank is the only person charged with this type of conduct.

The fact that he may go to prison here today, the fact that he may go to prison here today is a huge unwarranted disparity to what the other people who likely were mismarking portfolios across Wall Street and maybe, as your Honor observed, within Credit Suisse.

THE COURT: It's hard for me to believe that the only cooking of the books case is involving Mr. Serageldin.

MR. CASEY: The only cooking of the books case -- the only case we can find resulting from the credit crisis, this is the case that we see. If there are other ones in other districts, that's possible.

THE COURT: There's so many cooking of the books. I've had many of them.

MR. CASEY: Yes, your Honor. If you're talking about accounting fraud or stock options backdating, certainly there are numerous of those. But a criminal prosecution for something that happened when the credit world sort of came down around Mr. Serageldin's head --

THE COURT: I think if you narrow your definition to such an extent that it makes it meaningless, you get what you say. I can't accept that. What's the difference of inflating assets to make out a more attractive IPO than inflating assets

to post a better 10-K? 1 2 MR. CASEY: I agree with that, your Honor, and that's 3 why many of the disparity cases --4 THE COURT: So why is Mr. Serageldin's case different 5 from so many others? 6 MR. CASEY: Because we see a national press call for 7 cases resulting from the credit crisis. You can find an article once a month in the financial papers saying where are 8 9 the people that are prosecuted from this? How come there's 10 nobody senior prosecuted from this? And the fact -- I don't 11 know if that's true or not and I believe it to be true, but the fact that Mr. Serageldin is one of only a few coming from late 12 13 2007, 2009 time period is regrettable. 14 THE COURT: It reminds me of five robbers complaining 15 that the sixth did not get caught. 16 MR. CASEY: Yeah, I agree, your Honor. But the 17 problem is --18

THE COURT: Surely you have better arguments than that.

MR. CASEY: Maybe I should move on. In this point, Mr. Serageldin is the sixth robber. The other five seem to have gotten away.

THE COURT: All right, Mr. Casey.

MR. CASEY: I've move on.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Persuade me, will you please.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CASEY: I will, your Honor, I will.

The other disparity case I want to bring to the Court's attention is a different form of conduct.

THE COURT: I don't know what prompted Judge Rakoff to give the stock optioner six months and not the guidelines or much closer to the quidelines. Every case has essential differences to it, so I don't know. And measuring the impact of the frauds in stock options is different from measuring the impact of the fraud with regard to inflating books. It's hard to compare those two things.

MR. CASEY: All that we have, your Honor, is the transcript.

THE COURT: We have Judge Chin's sentencing of Madoff, which you'll argue is a much worse situation and I would agree. It's very hard to do that kind of an equation.

MR. CASEY: To look at the disparity cases and find ones that fit perfectly, I a hundred percent agree, your Honor. What we're left with when we have to make the disparity argument is to look at cases --

THE COURT: What's driving the guidelines here?

MR. CASEY: The guidelines are being driven by something that doesn't seem to apply to the case.

THE COURT: Talk to me about that.

MR. CASEY: The compensation --

THE COURT: What's driving the guideline? How did the

DBMLSERS Sentence

```
probation and the government calculate that there should be an
1
 2
      upward adjustment of -- what was it -- 18?
 3
               MR. CASEY: Your Honor, that's derived from the
 4
      compensation that, the intended compensation that
 5
     Mr. Serageldin --
 6
               THE COURT: How much would Mr. Serageldin have gotten
 7
      if he didn't inflate the assets?
8
               MR. CASEY: He would have gotten the same amount of
9
     money, your Honor.
10
               THE COURT:
                          So why don't you tell me about that.
11
               MR. CASEY:
                          He would have gotten the same amount of
12
     money for a number of reasons. No. 1 is these little --
13
               THE COURT: So there's three components. Salary would
14
      have been the same.
                          Right?
15
               MR. CASEY:
                          Right.
16
               THE COURT:
                          Equity?
17
               MR. CASEY:
                           Same.
18
               THE COURT:
                          Really?
19
               MR. CASEY: Yeah, and I'll get to that in a second.
20
      Three components: salary, cash bonus, and deferred
21
      compensation. Salary is set.
22
               THE COURT: That's a small amount, that's 279,000.
23
               MR. CASEY: Correct. Under Credit Suisse's
24
      compensation regime, the cash bonus is capped out at a certain
25
      number and that number is what Mr. Serageldin received.
```

1 | would have received another call it --

THE COURT: Is there a discretionary element in the bonus?

MR. CASEY: Of course, your Honor, but there's a serious compensation regime in place. If Mr. Serageldin at the time he spotted --

THE COURT: Suppose he had a loss. Would he have gotten the cash bonus?

MR. CASEY: I understand what you're saying. Your Honor, I think it's important to step back. If he had a loss in what? Mr. Serageldin managed a massive number of books for the bank, I think it was 30 of them.

THE COURT: There was a secular decline in the securities that Mr. Serageldin was trading. It was experienced all over the business.

MR. CASEY: Sure.

THE COURT: And at that particular point in time, there was a question to what extent the loss might or might not be realized. The loss was really not a loss. It was the beginning of a trend. Mr. Serageldin's position made — there was a large subjective element in the valuation of stocks and securities in the market each day. Nevertheless, there was an inflation of assets.

So what would have happened if Mr. Serageldin's book showed a loss rather than profit, would he have gotten the

1 bonus? Probably not. 2 MR. CASEY: I submit, your Honor, respectfully, he 3 absolutely would have received the bonus, absolutely. 4 Mr. Serageldin --5 THE COURT: Same amount? 6 Yes, without question, because --MR. CASEY: 7 Why did he plead to this? THE COURT: 8 MR. CASEY: I'm sorry, your Honor? 9 THE COURT: Why did he plead to this upward 10 adjustment? 11 MR. CASEY: Because there is a certain marking of a 12 portfolio that has to occur. And in this book, the ABN1 book, 13 was one of about 32 books. 14 THE COURT: I grant you that. But it's driven by 15 loss. 16 MR. CASEY: It is. 17 Intended loss to the bank. THE COURT: 18 MR. CASEY: Correct. THE COURT: So it leads to me to believe because there 19 20 is a plea and agreement on this that everyone agreed that the 21 bank lost so much money. 22 MR. CASEY: There came a moment when Mr. Serageldin 23 looked at how his subordinates and the people he was 24 responsible for were marking the portfolio. For the most part,

they were marking it within an acceptable range. And then at

25

DBMLSERS Sentence

the very, very end of the year, the end of the year he saw and experienced that they had marked outside of the range, and he saw that on the report that was circulated within the bank. He looked at that report and on that report he saw that these were mismarked. And that, your Honor, is why he pled guilty because at that point, as Mr. Kim said, he could have stopped this.

THE COURT: There's two aspects to pleading guilty.

He pleaded guilty to the statutory offense.

MR. CASEY: Correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: But in the plea agreement, there's also an agreement with regard to the intended loss or the foreseeable loss.

MR. CASEY: Right.

THE COURT: And it's equated with his bonus.

MR. CASEY: Right.

THE COURT: The bonus drove that figure.

MR. CASEY: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: Why did you agree?

MR. CASEY: No. 1, Mr. Serageldin wanted to accept responsibility. No. 2, in this era with the guidelines still in place and when you negotiate and when he wants to accept responsibility, there are only a number of options left to him.

Now, obviously he could have done a couple different things, but that he pled guilty to that number was because that's the number that our world, that 2B1.1 suggests has to

DBMLSERS Sentence

drive a case like this. That's not the law that governs you, but that's where all the pleas are discussed in cases like this. So you do your best.

THE COURT: I understand they're discussed, but why did you agree?

MR. CASEY: Because he believed he violated the law and he did not want to go to trial. He did not -- he thought it would be better to save the government the cost and expense of such a thing.

THE COURT: Doesn't the plea agreement state that you agree that those are the guidelines?

MR. CASEY: We agree that those are the guidelines, and every argument I'm making to you, to be clear, is under 18 U.S.C. 3553(a).

THE COURT: Yeah, you have to do that because you're precluded from going back to the guidelines. So you can't help me.

MR. CASEY: I can't help you on what question, your Honor?

THE COURT: Why the intended loss should be where it was.

MR. CASEY: The intended loss shouldn't be there. The intended loss should mirror something closer to what the goal of this conspiracy was, at least from my client's point of view.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: The bank takes the position they lost the amount they paid in bonus. They want it back in restitution.

MR. CASEY: I haven't seen those papers yet, your Honor, but if they do, the couple things I think are very important to keep in mind. No. 1 is Mr. Serageldin worked for a year.

Do you agree they would be entitled to it? THE COURT: MR. CASEY: No, your Honor. Mr. Serageldin worked on a huge amount of responsibility at the bank. We would call this less than 5 percent of his responsibilities, the ABN1 And then within that 5 percent of responsibilities, the actual adjustments that are the center of this, there's an extremely small amount of conduct.

And, again, I don't want to undercut the seriousness of this crime and he accepts responsibility, your Honor. But that the bank didn't get value for the massive and billions of dollars that he made for the bank is frankly an unreasonable argument that the bank would make.

> THE COURT: Okay.

MR. CASEY: Your Honor, in closing, I just want to touch on a couple points. I also have know Mr. Serageldin for a long period of time. He is a good man. He is a man that cares very much about others. He's the kind of person that even today on the way down with whatever is about to happen to him --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: There's a deepening mystery in my work: Why do so many good people do bad things?

MR. CASEY: Your Honor, I think the case here is this is people are under an intense amount of pressure. People sort of have a view of themselves. They have a view of, you know, I've been really successful academically. I've been really successful professionally. And I'm confronted with failure for the first time in my life and they make a mistake and that is what happened here.

Now, this is a big mistake and this is a mistake that lasted for more than a handful of weeks, but people make mistakes. But what we're here for and what really the purpose of 3553(a) is is to get an understanding of the whole person, what Kareem was like before this happened, how he dealt with this after it happened, and what he's going to be like going forward.

And under 3553(a), your Honor, I feel like you do, and I agree with your Honor, we have a very good person here, a person who cares a lot about his family, his friends, person he walks by in the street.

We saw a recommendation from probation and we believe that is a step in the right direction here. Maybe not large enough, but we think it's a step in the right direction. I think and I hope, your Honor, through our papers you're seeing you have a high quality person here, a flawed maybe one that

**DBMLSERS** Sentence

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

made a mistake, but a flawed person but someone who is good, who had strived to do well, who has happened people along the way, a family man, a dedicated family man, and one that has made a mistake. But we don't want -- the press is going to define

Mr. Serageldin by that mistake. We don't define him by that mistake.

THE COURT: Probation has recommended 36 months. Do you think they have it right?

MR. CASEY: No, your Honor. I think they have a step in the right direction, I do, but.

> THE COURT: What do you think is right?

What do I think is right, I would be MR. CASEY: persuaded in this case, your Honor, by the massive amount of punishment he's received. I would.

THE COURT: Everybody who's found out receives that punishment in one degree or another.

MR. CASEY: I'm sorry, your Honor?

Everyone who is found out in the crime THE COURT: he's committed receives that punishment one way or another.

> MR. CASEY: Thirty-six months?

THE COURT: No. Massive amount of punishment already achieved.

MR. CASEY: Okay. We're going to have to disagree on that, your Honor. What I would give, I would sentence him to

DBMLSERS Sentence

no jail time or extremely nominal amount of jail time. And for the deterrence factor here, I would point to what has happened to him. In the government's papers they point to their deterrence argument.

THE COURT: That's no deterrence.

MR. CASEY: What's that, your Honor?

THE COURT: You're found out on your crime, you give up your criminal acts. You give up your criminal gain. That's a deterrent?

MR. CASEY: No, your Honor, I'm not getting through. The first \$20 million has nothing to do with his crime. I actually argue --

THE COURT: That's not what the public ruling said.

MR. CASEY: I think, your Honor, as the government writes in its brief, the people we want to deter are other Wall Street professions like Mr. Serageldin who maybe would have to make that decision tomorrow.

THE COURT: And how do you deter them?

MR. CASEY: How do you deter --

THE COURT: By saying if you're found out, you give up what you got?

MR. CASEY: No, your Honor. I think you can easily look at what happened to Mr. Serageldin's life since that day and his life has been ruined in every single respect and financially is one of them, but that's not even, that's not the

RS Sentence

```
1
      big one.
               He's unemployable. He has lost face to his family.
 2
               THE COURT: History shows that every one of the people
 3
      who went on to Wall Street and did something wrong and came
 4
      back out of jail and did something again find something again.
 5
      So to argue that Mr. Serageldin's future is bleak now is a
6
     misquided argument. It insults your client, it insults your
 7
      client's capability, and it insults your client's background.
               Sure, he'll be punished and sure he'll have
8
9
      repercussions and consequences. But to get me to believe that
10
      he won't be able to get back on his feet again, I don't believe
      it.
11
                          I agree with you, your Honor.
12
               MR. CASEY:
13
                           So why are you telling me that?
               THE COURT:
14
                          But not to the level of where he was.
               MR. CASEY:
                          Of course not. He committed a crime.
15
               THE COURT:
                                                                  Не
      committed a serious crime. Shouldn't he be punished?
16
17
               MR. CASEY: He should, your Honor, and I believe he
18
          And, your Honor, I believe if you needed to punish him,
19
      there are other ways to punish him besides a 36-month --
20
               THE COURT: Like what, community service?
21
               MR. CASEY:
                          Yes, your Honor, or a financial penalty.
22
               THE COURT:
                          That too. Okay. Thank you very much.
23
               MR. CASEY:
                           Thank you, your Honor.
24
               THE COURT:
                           Mr. Ingoglia.
25
               MR. INGOGLIA: I'm going to try to respond to the
```

24

25

Sentence

points your Honor wants to hear. There are a couple things 1 2 defense counsel said. THE COURT: I think that level of 25 overstates the 3 4 seriousness of the offense. 5 MR. INGOGLIA: First I wanted to clarify how that's 6 calculated because it's not simply calculated on the basis of 7 Kareem Serageldin's bonus. Also included in that calculation is the bonus that David Higgs got, his coconspirator, who 8 9 incidentally is when we're talking about other financial crisis 10 cases that have been charged, there are two of Mr. Serageldin's 11 coconspirators who have been charged in this district. 12 THE COURT: People in his group. 13 MR. INGOGLIA: Yeah, people in his group, Mr. Higgs 14 and Mr. Siddiqui. 15 THE COURT: Who have lesser culpability. 16 MR. INGOGLIA: Correct. 17 THE COURT: One would argue. 18 MR. INGOGLIA: Correct, they're subordinate to him in 19 the hierarchy of Credit Suisse. Mr. Higgs got a bonus of 20 1.6 million. Salmaan Siddiqui got a bonus of 930,000, roughly. 21 And another coconspirator got a bonus of 250,000. 22 Even if you took out Mr. Serageldin's bonus -- and I 23

want to talk about that in a minute; I don't think that's the right way to look at it -- but even if you took out, if you add the bonuses of the coconspirators, you're still over that

Sentence

2.5 million number. You're in that same guidelines range.

THE COURT: This argues that they got their whole bonus because of the overstatement.

MR. INGOGLIA: But he argued it with respect to his particular situation because he had --

THE COURT: I think it's very complicated.

MR. INGOGLIA: But with respect to Higgs it's not. With respect to Salmaan Siddiqui it's not. Their primary responsibilities were this book, this particular book that had the fraud in it. And I think this argument is suggested in the defense submission as well. With respect to Higgs, Higgs' bonus turns on how well that book does. If that book does crappy, he's not getting a big bonus, he just isn't.

And Salmaan Siddiqui, same thing. His job is, you know, putting those marks on that book. He doesn't have that vast array of books that Mr. Serageldin had. He didn't have that broad degree of responsibility that Mr. Serageldin had, it's true. But their bonuses are much more tightly tied to that performance in that particular book.

It makes sense. You got to start from consider what the options are for trying to come to a fair guidelines calculation here. Nobody is arguing it was the amount of the restatement. Nobody is arguing it was the amount of the overall misstatement in the book, right. Those are giant numbers. Nobody is arguing that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The compensation, the intended compensation of the group that was involved in the mismarking makes perfect sense as a proxy. And even if you take Kareem Serageldin's bonus out, it's still the same level we've been talking about, still at 25 because you're over 2.5 million.

And I submit to you that's a likely reason why, I don't want to speak for the defense, but it makes sense that they would agree to something like that for that reason.

THE COURT: It's idle for me to really make a precise finding on how much of the bonus depended on the mismarking of the books and the cooking of the books.

MR. INGOGLIA: Can I make one other observation in that regard, if I may, common sense argument, not an I'm privy to secret information argument. If Credit Suisse had known that a crime was happening, that people working for them were committing a crime, at the time they were deciding whether or not to pay a bonus --

THE COURT: There would be no bonus at all.

MR. INGOGLIA: -- there would be no bonus at all.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this. Suppose they had not falsified books, would there have been any bonuses? We don't know, do we?

MR. INGOGLIA: I don't think we know to a certainty. I think if there had been no, there had been no mismarking, then I think Mr. Serageldin has a fair argument that some of

25

Sentence

his other activities would have gotten him at least some bonus. 1 I don't know if we can know what the amount would have been, 2 3 but I think it's persuasive he had a lot of responsibility. 4 THE COURT: I can't accept the argument that the 5 entirety of the bonuses depended on the falsified books. I 6 think it was influenced, it was affected, but I can't say it 7 was total. So I come to the conclusion that there's a certain degree of overstatement of points. How much, I don't know. 8 9 MR. INGOGLIA: I won't belabor it if you've come to 10 that conclusion. 11 THE COURT: Under 5K2.0, I would tend to find that 12 there should be some element of departure. Even though you and 13 defense counsel agreed on the application of the guidelines, I 14 wouldn't go along with you. I don't think it's necessary for 15 me to find exactly how much departure there should be, but I think 57 months is high. 16 17 What do you think of the probation office recommendation of 36 months? 18 19 MR. INGOGLIA: We think it's too generous. We 20 think --21 THE COURT: Why do you think it's too generous? 22 MR. INGOGLIA: Especially because -- and Mr. Casey is 23 right that this is a primary part of our argument -- the need 24 for general deterrence in a case like this is especially

important. I think when there's talk, you know, in your

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

colloquy with defense counsel about why good people do bad things, and it could be intense pressure, it could be hubris, it could be greed, right, there's many things that could motivate people at different times.

But the fact that, you know, you keep seeing good people do bad things and that in cases like this people who otherwise seem to live admirable lives do cross the line, that cries out for a strong deterrent message. That's what it cries out for. You need somebody in that situation to say to themselves, wow, it's tempting, it's going to be very hard for people to detect if I mess around with something like this, but it's not worth the risk of going to jail. You need that kind of strong message.

THE COURT: A zero sum game doesn't do it.

MR. INGOGLIA: Correct.

THE COURT: Which is what Mr. Casey is arguing.

MR. INGOGLIA: I think that's right. You've got to deter people from crossing that line. And how you're going to do that, it has to be a serious sentence.

THE COURT: The judges don't know, nobody knows what level of deterrence you need and what's accomplished by one sentence over another. So we still are in the land of intuition.

MR. INGOGLIA: I think that's right, Judge, and I think that it's the burden and challenge of where you're

DBMLSERS Sentence

sitting, right, in setting a sentence. I agree a hundred 1 percent. Finding the right balance is what you've got to do. 2 3 THE COURT: Another thing that bothers me here, that Credit Suisse created a climate. We learned that there was a 4 5 hundred billion dollars of overstatement. 6 MR. INGOGLIA: It says more than a hundred, more than 7 a hundred million. THE COURT: Hundred million dollars. 8 9 MR. INGOGLIA: More than a hundred million. 10 THE COURT: Easy for me to substitute zeroes, take 11 them away and add them on. A hundred million dollars of 12 overstatement. 13 And the share of overstatement in Mr. Serageldin's 14 department was how much? 15 MR. INGOGLIA: I'm sorry, I was answering the second question. They restated by more than a billion dollars, right. 16 17 THE COURT: The bank misstated for a billion dollars. 18 MR. INGOGLIA: It's actually more than. I can --19 MR. CASEY: Your Honor, we have the number. The bank 20 restated for over \$2.65 billion. 21 THE COURT: 2.65 billion. And how much --22 MR. CASEY: The overstatement, the government's 23 position, I believe, is about a hundred million dollars. Ιt 24 may even be slightly more.

THE COURT: Say that again.

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CASEY: The government's position I think is a hundred million. Our position is that number is also exaggerated.

THE COURT: What is the number that you think should be attributed to the inflation of Mr. Serageldin's responsibility?

A little less than \$40 million, maybe even MR. CASEY: less than that.

THE COURT: What do you say, Mr. Ingoglia?

MR. INGOGLIA: More than a hundred million dollars.

THE COURT: Let's take a hundred million. percent of 2.65 billion?

MR. INGOGLIA: A very low percent.

THE COURT: Which means that there was either a terrible climate in the bank because people tend to know what other people are doing. And Mr. Serageldin's crime, and it is a crime, was a crime that was duplicated by many others in many other departments. I think that's a fair inference for me to take, and I have to put that into finding the fair sentence also. It doesn't mitigate his crime, but it does mitigate his culpability in a sense.

MR. INGOGLIA: I think all I can say to that is we take the facts as we find them. Where we see evidence of a crime, we pursue it and we prove what we can prove.

THE COURT: I understand. It's not always easy.

23

24

25

Sentence

Quite hard. I know because I worked in that area. I know how 1 2 hard it is to prove that. 3 Thank you, Mr. Ingoglia. 4 Mr. Serageldin, you have a right to --5 MR. CASEY: Your Honor, before Mr. Serageldin speaks, 6 his mother would like to address the Court very briefly if that 7 would be okay. THE COURT: Okay. Come up, ma'am. Tell your name to 8 9 the court reporter. 10 MRS. SERAGELDIN: Sarheeldin Serageldin. 11 Thank you very much, your Honor, for allowing me to 12 speak to you today. I'm Kareem's mother. 13 Please speak louder. It's not going to THE COURT: 14 help you much. You need your voice. And I know you're 15 nervous. So just try to relax, speak slowly and loudly. MRS. SERAGELDIN: Thank you very much, your Honor, for 16 17 allowing me to speak to you today. I'm Kareem's mother and 18 this is, as you must imagine, very difficult because I know I 19 have just this one chance to try to present my son to you the 20 way I know him to be, which is a very kind, loving, 21 responsible, upright, modest young man. 22

And I don't know, I don't understand much about, actually anything about the offense. Obviously, I'm not here to talk about that. But I just would like to speak to your Honor about my son.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I know we raised him to value honor and integrity and he's always held himself up to high standards as far as I know. And we came to this country, my husband and I, immigrated to this country when he was not quite seven years old. going on seven. And it was a struggle, as with many immigrant families, especially at the beginning to, you know, to make a living and raise our children.

And I think Kareem saw us struggle and he really internalized those values of really hard work and high expectations. And we never once had to ask him to study and he always tried to exceed our expectations for him if he could and he always did, which is why it's so hard to be talking to you about him today because we've always been so proud of him. He's always made us so proud.

And it's also so hard to see him suffer and when you see your child suffer, you suffer. And he has been suffering horribly in the five plus years since this ordeal started. was only 34 and his whole world came to an end. And he's been hounded, hounded from his homes, you know, first one apartment in London, then another one, humiliated and publicly arrested. And when he never tried to, you know, he's always available, but still he was made a public spectacle of. And he's already suffered so very much with the stress of seeing him throwing up time after time. And he tries to hide it as best he can because that's how he is, but he's really suffered horribly and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

we all suffer with him.

We're a close family and he's the rock of the family. It's his character that he's protective, responsible one. But also partly in Egyptian culture, and we're from Egypt, it's the oldest son who takes the responsibility. And it's not just me and his father and but his whole extended family.

When his uncle had a heart attack, he was visiting London and he had a heart attack, it's Kareem who took care of everything and took care of him, nursed him after, took him home and nursed him after. And his uncle said so many times since then while he was being rushed off in the ambulance, at least he knew if anything happened to him, he'd look after his family in Egypt.

I'm sorry, your Honor. I'm know I'm rambling.

THE COURT: You're not rambling. Take your time and tell me what you want. I know you're speaking from the heart.

MRS. SERAGELDIN: I just want to say, your Honor, I wish I could show you the six-year-old he was when we came to the States. And he was small for his age, but he also, we had him skip a grade so he was really tiny for his class and he was teased so horribly and bullied so much.

THE COURT: You're speaking to a very short person.

MRS. SERAGELDIN: But he stayed that way, your Honor, for the longest time. And, you now, he was really teased and bullied and it wasn't just how tiny he was, but also his thick

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

glasses and bushy hair and he had all the odd clothes and odd accent. And I think he just felt he always had to work twice as hard as everyone else to be accepted. And he always had to get things exactly right because no one would ever give him any leeway and he just, he's still that way inside, you know, the little boy who always has to get everything right and work twice as hard as everyone else.

And I know he probably doesn't want me to say this, but he's very vulnerable inside and tries to hide it. But we know, his family, his close friends, we all know how self-quarded he is and how vulnerable he is and how much he tries to hide it. And we all need him so much. Not just us, I mean his father and I, his brother, but most also Kareem has a woman, they've been together for 14 years. She wouldn't want me -- she'd be lost without him. I know she won't mind my saying that. And they haven't really started their life properly together because everything has been put on hold because this, since this started over five years ago, they can't make plans, they can't. So there's that as well.

And most of all, your Honor, if you will just indulge me one last thing, that's my mother who, his nana, my mother. When he was born, we were students at London University, my husband and I, both of us. And we couldn't -- we left him with my mother to raise the first few years of his life in Egypt with my mother and he's been the center of her universe ever

Sentence

since and they have a very, very close, close bond. And he used to visit her regularly and he hasn't been able to travel to see her in two years. She's 85, she's frail. We can't possibly tell her what's going on because it would be the end of her, quite literally, the end of her physically. She wouldn't survive the shock.

So we haven't been able to explain why he no longer comes to see her and it breaks his heart because he knows that she may not be there much longer, you know. And so I know she would be here today if she could and obviously she can't. She's in Cairo and doesn't travel, hasn't for years and we haven't even told her. But I just wanted on her behalf and on behalf of everyone in the family to let your Honor know about her as well.

The other thing please, your Honor, keep in mind his whole life history. He was only 34.

THE COURT: How life?

MRS. SERAGELDIN: His whole life history. He was only 34 and all his life he's been so responsible, so hardworking. He started working barely out of college and he was 21 in April the year he granted college and he started working and worked so hard every day, never, you know, always, always worked so hard and it was never, never for him about, I know that. It was always about winning that respect and approval that he had such a hard time winning when he was a little boy in high

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

school and so awkward and it's all about winning respect and approval for him. It was never, you know, achievement for him was never anything material. The only thing that might have gratified him was treating friends, family to treats or experiences he thought they might enjoy. But for him it's always been about winning that respect and approval that were so hard, the acceptance that were so hard to come by as he was growing up.

So if you would just please see him in context of his whole life history, if you would, your Honor, and keep in mind that as a mother when he suffers, you suffer, and whatever sentence he serves, you serve, and you only breathe free when he does. And also that I know my son. He would never ever conduct himself in a way as to be unworthy of your Honor's generosity should be choose to exercise it. And I'm really Thank you very much, very much.

THE COURT: Thank you very much for your remarks.

It's unfortunate that sometimes, most often the most substantial impact of sentencing is not on the defendant himself but on those who love him. I see this so many times. In a way, a defendant comes and he has prepared himself for the worst, but his family never does. And so when I pronounce a sentence, the people who feel it most are those who love the defendant.

The other thing I wanted to say is it's my obligation

DBMLSERS Sentence

to take into account all the personal characteristics of the person I'm sentencing. The law requires it and I try to do it as best I can. And I particularly appreciated your remarks because I too am a son of immigrants who came to the United States to find an opportunity that they never would have had had they not immigrated. In fact, they probably would not have been alive today. Today they're not alive, but when they came here.

So I understand your remarks and I appreciate them very much.

Mr. Serageldin.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, today is the most difficult day of my life. I never imagined I would be standing here awaiting sentencing for a crime. Your Honor, I'm sorry for what I have done. My terrible mistakes will remain with me for the rest of my life, mistakes that I'll have to explain shamefully to my Godchildren, as well as the children of my own I hope to have one day. I'm confident that I will never make these mistakes again, and I am certain I will never allow myself to be in a position like this again.

Throughout the course of this case, I have tried to conduct myself with dignity to prove to myself and to all those that I've let down that I'm better than my crime. Your Honor, I always believed by working harder than anyone I could succeed at almost anything. That was the case throughout my education,

as well as my time at Credit Suisse. I was proud of the reputation I built at the bank. Your Honor, I loved my job.

My terrible mistakes have caused me to lose my job, my career, my reputation, and caused great dishonor to myself, but more importantly, to my family and friends.

When I became aware of the conduct that brought me here, the right thing to do would have been to stop, correct and address the misconduct. I recognize that this was a crucial moment of my life and I see that I failed miserably in the decisions I made at this time. What is most painful to me is the knowledge that my actions have hurt and humiliated those that I love and care about the most, my family, my Godchildren, my friends, as well as colleagues, all of whom put their trust and confidence in me. I deeply apologize to them for the pain that I've caused them, and I thank them for their unconditional support over the course of the five plus years of this investigation.

In many ways, I do not deserve all of the support that I've received. It only adds to the shame and guilt I feel for having betrayed the trust and confidence they had in me. I made commitments in life to support family and friends. I have always upheld those commitments until now. It is therefore exceedingly difficult to imagine that going forward I may not be in a position to do so.

Many people rely on me, your Honor, which is what

Sentence

makes this so very hard. This is particularly true of my grandmother, who's too old and frail for me to explain to her why I can't probably ever be by her side again in Cairo.

I stand before you, your Honor, to accept whatever punishment you deem appropriate. I wish to have the opportunity to pay my debt to society and then to move forward and rebuild my life. I would only add that I pledge to prove worthy of your Honor's clemency should you grant it. I will not let you down.

Thank you, your Honor, for permitting me to address the Court today.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Serageldin.

Any district judge would be quick to say that the most difficult job of being a United States district judge is the job of sentencing human beings. We have the power to take away freedom from people. It's an awesome power. And for me, I never feel I get it right. You've already heard some of the comments I made as I tested both sides in the views they bring here.

There are so many different considerations the judge has to follow and they don't mesh. One stands in opposition to another. And there is no scientific way of putting it all together in coming to a conclusion that's satisfactory, not to the defendant, not to the government, and not to the judge himself for, as I say, I never have confidence that I have

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

gotten it right. All that I can do is do the best I can to harmonize all the considerations that come to play.

So Section 3553(a) of the criminal code tells the judge what considerations the judge should consider in sentencing a person. The judge is required to understand the nature and circumstances of the offense, and many of my questions have been probing of that nature and the aspect of the offense, which was the intended loss or the foreseeable loss to the employer.

I also have to understand the history and characteristics of the defendant. Your mother was eloquent in pleading your case. You could not have done what she's done or said what she has said. She spoke from the heart and it penetrated.

But that is not enough because I also need to consider a sentence that reflects the seriousness of the offense. Mr. Ingoglia talked about the need of imparting a sentence that will be taken as serious in the community of those who have to work in the fields where you worked.

The sentence has to promote a respect for law and to provide just punishment for the offense. Respect for law is crucial. People can't feel that there's one law for the person who committed a misbranding of drugs, who I sentenced before I reached you this morning, and for a person who works and lives at the highest echelon of our society. It's one law and one

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

law that must be just for everyone.

And it's so hard, so hard to make comparisons to what one judge did for one person and what I must do for another person or in what way I sentence one particular person and then have to sentence another person. Everyone is different. used to be that we would have the comfort of adding up the score in the sentencing guidelines and sentencing so that everyone thought there was equality, but there never was equality. There always were hidden considerations that either were or were not taken into consideration.

And so we've abandoned the sentencing quidelines as a rigid code. We are to consider them, among other things, but the judge is left on his own to find what is just, what is fair, what is appropriate.

I'm instructed to sentence in a way to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct. It's so important deterring not only the defendant himself, which I'm convinced you will not commit another crime and that any time you have a choice to make, you will choose very carefully in relationship to what is right and what is good and not been done those ideals. But others have to be influenced as well, and it's another aspect of how the community has to respect law and understand the seriousness of the crime that was committed.

I'm told I have to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant, which is not an issue with you, I am

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

sure, but it is an issue with others.

And I'm supposed to provide you with needed educational or vocational training, medical care, or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner, and I don't think these really apply to your case.

In all of this, I'm to impose a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with all these considerations. If one were to devise a set of criteria that will be more apt to cause consternation on the part of anyone having to apply them, it couldn't be other than these characteristics. Yet this is how I have to live, and this is how I have to conduct my sentences, to do what ultimately has to be fair and just.

And so I have to consider that you were in a position of trust and responsibility. In a financial world that was rather berserk at the time, each person has to look within himself and ask himself what is right, what is wrong, how do I adhere to the right and not do the wrong. Inflation of books is a wrong. Everyone working in the financial area knows that. Everyone in the financial area knows also the subjectivity of judgments, especially in an area where there is not an adequate market index.

And yet in all that with all the complexity, with all the difficulty, with all the tension and responsibility that comes into play, one must never forget to ask the question what

Sentence

am I compelled to do if I adhere to the right and in that you failed. And I understand this has been a five-year ordeal for you and that this ordeal has recked its own sense of punishment for you. You had to stand still. You have not been able to correct the past and go forward and I take this into consideration as well.

I take into consideration that the guidelines in terms of how it's driven by the amount of the loss is a very substantial overstatement, but yet your crime is a serious one. It has to teach people that in the worst of times what is right can not be sacrificed. We may not have gone through the worst of times. We did not get into a depression. People did not lose a whole society of economic structure. Many lost their jobs, many lost their ability to earn a good living, but somehow we passed it. But you failed in doing what was right. For this I have to punishment you.

I'll ask you to stand, Mr. Serageldin, while I deliver what I think is a fair and just punishment.

I sentence you to 30 months in custody. It's substantially less than the guideline range of 57 months, which I believe is an overstated amount. It's even less than probation has suggested. But I've taken into consideration what your mother has said, what your lawyers have said about you and all that you bring to the table. I'm convinced that perhaps by showing you a little more lenity than otherwise

DBMLSERS Sentence

might be available, but also sufficient severity to make it 1 clear that this is a serious offense, that I have done as best 2 3 I can to apply all the intentions of the quideline and 4 characteristics that apply. 5 Is there a recommendation where Mr. Serageldin should 6 serve? 7 MR. CASEY: Your Honor, we have an idea, but if possible, we'd like to submit it in writing to you maybe 8 9 Monday. 10 THE COURT: Yes. 11 MR. CASEY: Okay. Thank you, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: A writing about where I should recommend? 13 That's correct, your Honor. MR. CASEY: 14 Okay. So we'll defer the judgment until THE COURT: we receive that and I'll undoubtedly make the recommendation as 15 16 suggested. 17 Thank you. MR. CASEY: 18 THE COURT: I'll talk about supervised release in a few minutes. 19 20 There is a forfeiture in this case, is there not? 21 MR. INGOGLIA: There's an agreed to amount, yes, 22 Judge. 23 THE COURT: And you'll submit a judgment? 24 MR. INGOGLIA: We will. We'll submit, if your Honor 25 is okay with it, next week. We'll submit a preliminary, on

consent by the parties, a preliminary order of forfeiture. 1 THE COURT: And it will be in the amount 2 3 \$1,003,368.61? 4 MR. INGOGLIA: That's correct. 5 THE COURT: In terms of restitution, is there any -you can sit down for a few minutes, Mr. Serageldin. 6 7 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you. THE COURT: Is there any suggestion about restitution? 8 9 MR. INGOGLIA: It's discretionary, we believe, in this 10 So it is up to your Honor. case. 11 THE COURT: Well, it's discretionary in what sense? 12 It's mandatory, isn't it? 13 MR. INGOGLIA: The statute to which the defendant pled 14 is not included among the mandatory restitution list of enumerated statutes. So the issue of restitution is entirely 15 within your discretion, whether to order it or not and also to 16 17 what extent. 18 THE COURT: Do you have a suggestion how I should 19 exercise my discretion? 20 MR. INGOGLIA: I don't, Judge. I think we should 21 leave it to your recommendation. 22 THE COURT: Is there any representative of Credit 23 Suisse here? 24 I believe that restitution is not appropriate. I 25 think the bank, having created a climate in which

Sentence

DBMLSERS

Mr. Serageldin has operated and not having shown to what extent, if at all, the bonuses paid to him would not otherwise have been paid, is not entitled to restitution. If it is entitled to restitution, it feels that way, it can bring a separate action. But I do not order restitution in this action without prejudice to whatever may be determined in some other lawsuit.

I think a fine would be appropriate. Does the government have a suggestion?

MR. INGOGLIA: We're not recommending any specific amount, Judge. We would leave it to you. The range as you pointed out is the guidelines.

THE COURT: Tell me about the forfeiture, is it an amount that was found?

MR. INGOGLIA: The amount of the forfeiture is calculated by taking the amount of the bonus, which was 1.7 million, and essentially — let me start over. The 1.7 was the amount of the bonus. He actually received the amount of the forfeiture, \$1,003,368.61, because that is what the amount was actually paid after taxes.

THE COURT: So, in other words, it's in a sense what he got from.

MR. INGOGLIA: It's the bonus.

THE COURT: Okay. I think a fine in addition would be appropriate. The guidelines provide a fine of \$10,000 to a

DBMLSERS Sentence

hundred thousand dollars. I'm going to impose a fine of \$150,000.

When can it be paid?

MR. CASEY: Within 30 days, your Honor.

THE COURT: Paid let's say by January 15.

MR. CASEY: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: 2014.

Supervised release will be for two years, subject to the following conditions: those set out at the top of page 3 under the caption in the PSIR mandatory conditions, plus the 13 standard conditions.

I decline to impose the financial conditions in the third, fourth, third and fourth paragraphs under standard and special conditions on page 29.

And impose the condition of obeying the immigration laws and complying with the directives of immigration authorities.

Mr. Serageldin will be supervised by the district of his residence and is to report to the nearest probation office within 72 hours following release from custody.

The mandatory special assessment of \$100 will be due upon the filing of the judgment.

I want to impose an obligation of community service for the two years of supervised release at the rate of 25 hours per quarter, 25 hours per quarter for each of the two years.

25

Sentence

Mr. Serageldin and his lawyers will suggest a type of community 1 service to the probation officer, and it shall be subject to 2 3 the approval of the probation officer. 4 When would Mr. Serageldin like to surrender? 5 MR. CASEY: The end of January, your Honor, if that's 6 possible. 7 THE COURT: Yes. THE DEPUTY CLERK: January 28 --8 9 MR. CASEY: Thank you. 10 THE COURT: -- 2014, at 2 p.m., at the facility 11 identified by the Bureau of Prisons. Thank you, your Honor. 12 MR. CASEY: 13 THE COURT: Except for advice on appeal and underlying counts, is there anything I missed, Mr. Ingoglia? 14 15 MR. INGOGLIA: No, Judge. THE COURT: Any suggestions, objections? 16 17 MR. INGOGLIA: None. 18 THE COURT: Objections by the defense? 19 MR. CASEY: Nothing, your Honor. Thank you. 20 THE COURT: So all the punishment is so ordered. 21 I advise you, Mr. Serageldin, that you have a right to 22 appeal. You should discuss with counsel whether or not you 23 wish to appeal. If Mr. Serageldin wishes to appeal, I instruct 24 counsel to do so on a timely basis. Counsel will review the

plea agreement to see if appeal is waived. In any event, it's

1 Mr. Serageldin's choice.

If you can't afford a lawyer, Mr. Serageldin, you have a right for counsel at every stage of the proceeding and the government will pay for a lawyer and it will be assigned under the Criminal Justice Act.

Underlying Counts Two and Three.

MR. INGOGLIA: Counts Two and Three the government moves to dismiss.

THE COURT: Without objection so ordered.

I think we're concluded. Anything further?

MR. INGOGLIA: Nothing further from the government.

THE COURT: So, Mr. Serageldin, this in a way closes a chapter in your life, opens another chapter, which will be difficult, but it's something you can accomplish. You can find good in any place if you look for it and pursue it. And thereafter, you're a young man and your life remains an open book. I'm sure you will learn from it and be a better person for it. People love you. And I wish you the best.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor.